1	UNITED STATES BA WESTERN DISTRICT	NKRUPTCY COURT OF NEW YORK	
3	IN RE:		
4	NIAGARA FRONTI	ER HOCKEY, LLP,	BK #88
5		Debtor.	BK #03-10210
6			
7			
8		Proceedings held be	fore the
9	HONORABLE MICHAE	L J. KAPLAN, United	States
10	Bankruptcy Court	Judge, taken in Sui	te 350, Part I
11	of the courthous	e at the OLYMPIC TOW	ERS, 300 Pearl
12	Street, Buffalo,	New York, on March	30, 2004,
13	commencing at 10	:08 A.M.	
14			
15			
16	APPEARANCES:	NIXON PEABODY, LLP,	
17		BY: WILLIAM S. THOM Clinton Square, P.O	. Box 1051,
18		Rochester, New York Appearing for the D	
19		HANCOCK & ESTABROOK	, LLP,
20		BY: CAMILLE HILL, 1500 MONY Tower I,	P.O. Box 4976,
21		Syracuse, New York Appearing for Credi	13221-4976, tors' Committee.
22		ZDARSKY, SAWICKI &	AGOSTINELLI,
23		BY: MARK J. SCHLANT 404 Cathedral Place	ESQ.,
24		298 Main Street, Buffalo, New York,	_
25		Appearing for Fleet	Bank.

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
		2
1	PHILLIPS, LYTLE, HITCHCOCK, BLAINE & HUBER,	
2	BY: WILLIAM J. BROWN, ESQ., 3400 HSBC Center,	
3	Buffalo, New York, Appearing for the HSBC Bank.	
4		
5	UNDERBERG & KESSLER, LLP, BY: JANE F. CLEMENS, ESQ.,	
6	1900 Main Place Tower, Buffalo, New York,	
7	Appearing for Hockey Western New York.	
8	HODGSON RUSS, LLP, BY: CHERYL R. STORIE, ESQ.,	
9	1300 Guaranty Building, Buffalo, New York,	
10	Appearing as special counsel to the Committee.	
11	APPEARING TELEPHONICALLY:	
12		
13	WILKIE FARR & GALLAGHER, P.C., BY: ROGER NETZER, ESQ., Appearing for Adelphia debtors.	
14	SALOMON, GREEN & OSTROW,	
15	BY: CHESTER SALOMON, ESQ., and JOCELYN KEYNES, ESQ.,	
16	Appearing for Key Bank.	
17	KASOWITZ, BENSON, TORRES & FRIEDMAN, LLP,	
18	BY: DANIEL ZINMAN, ESQ., Appearing for Adelphia	
19	Creditors Committee.	
20	PRESENT: BARBARA BUYERS, CSR, RPR, Court Reporter.	
21	oodi e Reporter .	
22	THE COURT: Let's note t	he
23	appearances in the courtroom, please.	
24	MR. THOMAS: William	
25	Thomas, Nixon Peabody, for the debtors.	

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

1 The parties have agreed we will set up a today. 2 date when those things --3 THE COURT: Let me, for 4 the minutes, because we have so many matters 5 showing up on the docket today, for the minutes, 6 let me be specific as to what those matters

were, by document number, if I have the document

numbers.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So we have here the HSBC Bank motion, which is -- here it is. It's a motion dated March 22nd. It was received here March the 23rd. I don't have a document number, and it was a motion by HSBC Bank returnable today at ten for an order enforcing Section 7 dot 06 of the plan and certain other relief. So that motion, which I believe resulted in at least one opposing document, is by the debtors, has been adjourned and will make a further order on that later?

MR. THOMAS: That's part of the pretrial, Your Honor. That was part of the agreement of the parties, if that's all right

with you.

THE COURT: The other was the motion by the debtors to approve a

	6
1	stipulation with certain Adelphia parties. This
2	motion is document number twelve, and that would
3	be to approve a stipulation and agreed order
4	that, among other things, would dismiss out the
5	Adelphia parties from AP 03 dash 1292.
6	Obviously, that motion is not compatible with
7	HSBC's motion and perhaps some other now
8	Mr. Schlant, you had a motion to intervene in
9	that AP.
10	MR. SCHLANT: Yes.
11	THE COURT: Is that also
12	being adjourned?
13	MR. SCHLANT: I had not been
14	asked to do it. I have not received any
15	opposition. I assumed it was going forward
16	today.
17	THE COURT: It was a
18	document consenting and joining from HSBC, from
19	Mr. Brown. Is that going forward today,
20	Mr. Thomas?
21	MR. THOMAS: I believe so.
22	The debtor has no objection to that.
23	THE COURT: Okay. Hold on
24	a minute, then. Let me find that. Let me see
25	if I can help make the minutes straight on that.
İ	

1 Okay. It's document number fifteen is the 2 motion by Fleet for leave to intervene in the 3 AP. 4 There subsequently was received, 5 on March the 25th, a consent and joinder of HSBC 6 in that motion. The debtor does not oppose. 7 there anyone else who wishes to be heard in 8 connection with that motion? 9 MR. ZINMAN: Your Honor, 10 Dan Zinman from Kasowitz, Benson, Torres & 11 Friedman. We have no opposition to the motion 12 to intervene except to say that there were 13 certain allegations made in there that might 14 conceivably have some impact on jurisdictional 15 questions and we reserve the right to dispute 16 those allegations at the appropriate time. 17 THE COURT: Fine. 18 Anything else? Then the motion to intervene is granted. You may submit the order, Mr. Schlant. 19 20 MR. SCHLANT: Thank you. 21 All right. 22 MR. THOMAS: Now, the 23 matter remaining on the calendar, Your Honor, is 24 the motion made March 19th by the debtor for

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

authorization and direction to disburse funds

25

	8
1	from the segregated account.
2	THE COURT: Okay. Hold on
3	a minute, because there's one other matter that
4	is housekeeping, and I do want to get it behind
5	us.
6	There is a couple of adjourned
7	claims objections on, Fiesta, Latina & Atwood.
8	We received a note from Mr. Mascitti that those
9	had been settled. Would there be orders to be
10	submitted?
11	MR. THOMAS: Yes. We will
12	be submitting orders, Your Honor.
13	THE COURT: Mark those
14	settled, please. Those were can you tell
15	from this whether there were others besides
16	those two that were on?
17	CHRISTINE KLIMKO: I think there
18	were just those two.
19	THE COURT: I'll give you
20	the claim numbers, then. Fiesta, Latina &
21	Allwood, not Atwood. And those are claims 109
22	and 271. So those are settled and the orders
23	are to be submitted.
24	MR. THOMAS: I'm also
25	pleased to inform the Court that all of the

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

claims that were subject to the first objection, the second objection have, in fact, been resolved and there are no outstanding claims objections that have not already been settled, merely pending submission of an order.

THE COURT: Good. Thank

you. Now again, to make sure that we're all on

the same page, Mr. Thomas is saying that what is

still on right now is a document that has been

assigned, document number 425, it is the notice

of motion by the debtors and debtors-in
possession for authorization and direction to

disburse funds from a segregated account.

Now, that motion elicited some other-filed documents. One is the reply of HSBC Bank, USA, to that motion. I don't have a document number, because I have only a chambers copy, either that or it was e-filed and it would not necessarily come to me with a document number. It was dated March 29, 2004. It was e-filed by Mr. William Brown.

Then I received a similar response from Key Bank and its counsel, Mr. Salomon and Ms. Keynes, which references the HSBC response, and then I received a somewhat similar response

from Fleet through its local counsel, Mr. Schlant.

Let me just make sure that that's everything in connection -- then I received the debtor's response to the HSBC reply. That was just handed up today. I don't have a document number on that. That was dated March 29. I think that's everything I have.

MR. THOMAS: It's

everything I've been served with, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Anybody think I'm missing something? Okay. All right.

I've read all the papers. The nature of the HSBC objection is -- it is limited and it's such as to oppose the segregation unless there is something in the nature of a credit given to HSBC; a credit up to the one point six million.

It was a credit that, according to Mr. Brown's papers, HSBC requested directly from the Adelphia parties. It was not obtained consensually, and HSBC opposes the distribution of the segregated account unless it is, by order of the Court, given a credit. The debtor's response to that objection argues that that

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. BROWN: Your Honor, it's a contingent credit, and I think that's the -
THE COURT: Oh, it's a continuing credit.

MR. BROWN: Contingent.

12 1 It effectively is a contingent credit because it 2 bears the outcome of the proceeding. 3 THE COURT: Okay. I sense 4 that that may have been lost on the debtor's 5 counsel, because they came back arguing that 6 it's premature. 7 MR. BROWN: Well, it's 8 only if. It's only to the extent that there is 9 a recovery in the so-called Adelphia AP. 10 MR. THOMAS: Let me just 11 address that. THE COURT: 12 So the other 13 extent to which I thought Fleet papers were 14 different, apparently the Fleet papers came in 15 after -- well, I'm not quite sure whether they 16 came in after the debtor's reply to the HSBC 17 papers or not, but the Fleet papers purport to 18 make an argument that HSBC and Key do not argue, 19 but I don't know -- and that has to do with what 20 Fleet believes are independent rights to pursue 21 these debtors; not rights that would be 22 derivative of a judgment in favor of Adelphia. 23 I don't know whether Fleet is situated 24 differently in that regard from HSBC and Key or 25 not.

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

	13
1	MR. BROWN: That's raised
2	in footnote three of the HSBC reply.
3	THE COURT: Okay.
4	MR. BROWN: We share the
5	same type of club provisions that are direct
6	claims against these debtors.
7	THE COURT: Okay. So I
8	think that that is the capsuled description of
9	the issues that have been joined before me this
10	morning. Mr. Thomas?
11	MR. THOMAS: Yes, Your
12	Honor. Just in fairness to all the parties,
13	attached to our response is a proposed order and
14	what we're really talking about here, to a
15	certain extent, is settling an order that I
16	believe all of the parties, including the banks
17	and the Adelphia debtors and others, are in
18	favor of these funds being distributed to the
19	relatively minor creditors, so that they can be
20	paid as Mr. Golisano intended when he executed
21	the purchase agreement.
22	THE COURT: The order
23	recites that there's been no opposition. Was
24	that
25	MR. THOMAS: I circulated

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

1 this around to everybody and hope springs 2 3 4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12 13

14

15

16

18

17

19 20

22

21

23

24 25

eternal that perhaps people would agree. Certainly, I'll have to -- the reason I haven't brought an order with me today was that I would have to put in all these various objections.

The debtor's view, and to a certain extent this is a discussion that has to take place between the banks and the Adelphia people as well. In my attempt to broker a deal, the debtor's position was until the litigation in the Adelphia Sabres matter is resolved, these claims are not only unsecured non-priority and contingent, they're hotly disputed.

Each of the banks maintain that they do not, in fact, owe any of this money. HSBC has been sued for twelve point six million, Key's been sued for four point seven million and Fleet's been sued for thirty point five million.

If they were successful, I don't believe there's any objection that their rights would share pro rata, with the exception of some adjustment in regard to the concession loan, which is a matter involving Fleet only. debtor's sole condition is it was a precondition to any of these claims being asserted against

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

this estate that a judgment has to be awarded in the Adelphia AP or in the AP that is pending before this Court, and therefore, we believe that whatever relief any of these banks are entitled to can be given in respect of the award at that time by that Court, and therefore, remember, keep in mind that what we're really talking about is that the million six will leave the jurisdiction of this court, be distributed to creditors. So the only question is, are the banks prejudiced by the release of those funds.

The debtor's position is that if, in fact -- since, in fact, they are not presently liable and could potentially only be liable, the only risk that they run which this Court can resolve by entering an order is to say that if it's determined, for example, that HSBC were liable for ten million dollars and HSBC establishes a right to a setoff, the million six can be deducted, or its pro rata share, from the award and therefore, HSBC is at no risk until that point.

This money need not be held up because all the banks will have available to it, through either the Adelphia AP or the Sabres AP,

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

complete and total relief before that court at that time.

That's consistent with our view that the Adelphia debtors have agreed, number one, in the stipulation that we've submitted to the Court that they continue to be bound by the stipulation and the order, and it's our view that that stipulation and order runs with the land, as it were. It runs with those obligations.

So for example, if a debtor were to sue somebody over the transfer of a piece of property and after the transfer occurred, the property was polluted, then it was an attempt to return it, there would be an offset generated. It would be either an affirmative defense, a counterclaim or an offset. And the court handling the particular adversary proceeding could work that out completely.

That said, our goal, and I believe the goal of the new Sabres, is to distribute these funds to the smaller creditors as quickly as possible. If I were able to draft a more detailed way to deal with the setoff issue or non-setoff issue, I would have done that. I'm

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

1 nervous as to what I would do, at the end of the 2 day, what we would merely ask this Court is 3 certainly to preserve and protect all of the 4 claims, defenses, offsets of the bank; all of 5 the claims, offsets and defenses of the Adelphia debtors and simply allow us to distribute these 6 7 funds and move towards wrapping up that aspect 8 of the case. Thank you, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Okay. 10 Mr. Brown? 11 MR. BROWN: I quess I'd 12 ask first, Your Honor, if there's anybody else 13 speaking in support. 14 THE COURT: In favor? 15 Sure. 16 MR. BROWN: Of the 17 debtor's motion. 18 THE COURT: Could I hear 19 argument to those in support? Ms. Storie? 20 MS. STORIE: Your Honor, 21 simply on behalf of our special counsel, again 22 appearing on behalf of the committee in a 23 special counsel capacity, solely with respect to 24 the HSBC claim, that constituency supports the 25 debtor's motion and asks that the Court grant it

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

18
over the objections of HSBC.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Ms. Hill, as to the matters that do not pertain
to HSBC?
MS. HILL: Yes, Your
Honor. I believe the Court is aware of our
position with regard to the committee
THE COURT: I had
forgotten it when we began, but then when Miss
Storie spoke, I remembered it.
MS. HILL: We're speaking
solely to those matters that do not impact HSBC
and we do not take a position in regard to those
matters. However, we're in a capacity
representing the trade vendors and the small
creditors Mr. Thomas alluded to would like to
get paid. And to that extent, we do support the
debtor's motion so we have those creditors paid
from this fund at this time.
THE COURT: Thank you.
Miss Clemens?
MS. CLEMENS: On behalf of
Hockey Western New York, Hockey Western New York
fully supports the debtor's motion, ask the
Court to enforce the purchase agreement and the

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

1 original intent of the purchase transaction and 2 permit the distribution to the creditors, reserving the bank's rights later to dispute 3 4 credits or offsets. Thank you. 5 THE COURT: Thank you. 6 And is there anyone participating by phone who 7 would support the debtor's proposal? 8 MR. ZINMAN: Adelphia 9 supports it. 10 THE COURT: Thank you. 11 Then since I know that I had limited opposition 12 from Key Bank, HSBC and Fleet Bank, let me turn, 13 now, to their positions. Mr. Brown? 14 MR. BROWN: Thank you, 15 Your Honor. What brought havoc to this case, 16 this Chapter 11 case pending before Your Honor 17 was, no one, other than Adelphia and its 18 creditors' committee, having fully participated 19 in the Chapter 11 case before Your Honor, and 20 Adelphia having been involved in the 21 negotiations leading to the sale, and in fact at 22 the sale hearing, which I suspect Mr. Schlant 23 will address in greater detail, in fact 24 negotiated and paid one of the three loans in 25 dispute, the concession loan and thereafter,

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

1 after the sale in the following summer, 2 commences an adversary proceeding seeking to 3 recover payments made not only on the construction loan made to the Knox brothers 4 5 essentially in 1995, but the concession loan to 6 which Adelphia consented to be paid out in full 7 in April, 2003. And the payoff balance 8 presumably taking into account the installment 9 payments that Adelphia and its creditors --10 THE COURT: Back up. 11 Adelphia permitted who to pay off what? 12 MR. BROWN: As part of the 13 NFHLP sale process, the team was sold in a 14 generic fashion. 15 THE COURT: Right. 16 MR. BROWN: The arena down 17 the street was sold, and many other assets. 18 THE COURT: Yes. 19 MR. BROWN: And we 20 thought, and Your Honor knew that we thought 21 Western New York and Southern Ontario had 22 benefitted by a transaction in which old and new 23 Sabres participated, the National Hockey League, 24 Adelphia appeared before Your Honor, both by New 25 York City counsel and by local counsel,

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

Mr. Lawson.

There were joint jurisdictional stipulations and orders entered by yourself and Judge Gerber in January and February of that year that essentially said we will not allow there to be dueling bankruptcies. We will allow Adelphia to come to Judge Kaplan's court to deal with all issues relating to the Sabres and the related assets. And based upon that transaction in April, 2003, one of the disputes lingering on the sale hearing date was whether the concession loan, made in 1995, had to be paid off in full.

We, on the one hand, were opposing the assumption of that Ioan. And as part of the sale process, Adelphia and the old Sabres and the old CALLC agreed that that Ioan would be paid off in full and we arrived at and agreed upon a payoff amount.

Presumably, that payoff amount included the installment payments that Adelphia and its creditors' committee now seek to recover.

So was the payoff balance incorrectly agreed to? It would appear so, from Adelphia's point of view after having allowed

Your Honor to enter an order which has become final. At no time during the pendency of the NFHLP and CALLC and associated cases, was there ever an assertion, wink and nod, innuendo that there was anything wrong or anything to be pursued about the recovery of payments made since 1995 through the history of those loans originally made to the Knox brothers when they were owners of the team. And there's no question there's a hundred and twenty-million-dollar arena down the street constructed with those monies.

Focusing on NFHLP's reply essentially to HSBC -- which is essentially a reply to Fleet and Key, because the issues are the same or very similar -- there's still no objection filed to the HSBC or Key Bank claims. There has been no objection filed.

THE COURT: Procedurally, there's been an adversary proceeding commenced seeking, among other things, to subordinate any such claims.

MR. BROWN: That's right.

It's not characterized that way. It's characterized a declaratory judgment to declare,

essentially, that what was done among the old Sabres, Adelphia and other parties, not including the banks, is binding on the banks. But as Your Honor knows, if you wish to oppose a subordination, Rule 7001 requires an adversary proceeding and notice.

We have a fundamental due process issue here, and unfortunately, while HSBC and the other banks have proposed a way to allow what we call the little creditors to be paid by the allowance of a contingent credit in the amount of the segregated fund, that, consensually, has not been achieved.

But going back is a significant due process issue. The declaratory judgment filed by NFHLP is not the form they're seeking -- that they're attempting to use to affect a distribution which would be the correct procedural posture in which to do this, because the banks are entitled to have the due process attributes of an adversary proceeding for the imposition of a subordination or any declaration that is binding, not motion practice.

The hanky panky, in my view, that's been brought to this court or been

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

brought to the larger situation has been caused by out-of-town parties and I'm concerned, as a matter of practice, that the view somewhat by Adelphia and its creditors' committee continues to be that it doesn't matter what Judge Kaplan ruled; we can bring claims related to what that court did and in fact, including payments that were made under an April, 2003 order, and that type of practice I don't think is the practice that's been condoned in any federal court that I know of, knowingly, and I would hope it would not be condoned here.

The Adelphia got its consideration that it wanted and negotiated for in the sale of the Sabres and the arena. It included such things as getting off of a very expensive letter of credit and other obligations that existed; it got off of the obligation to continue to fund the team, it got a new T.V. contract and a number of other things. It decided how it was going to negotiate for the sale. I just view this as a bad lesson to teach.

Mr. Thomas' arguments that the clawbacks are not applicable here are an evidentiary issue.

25 1 THE COURT: Clawback. 2 C-L-A-W-B-A-C-K. 3 MR. BROWN: The documents have express provisions, and if NFHLP wants to 4 5 litigate what those agreements either mean or 6 don't mean, the context to do that is in the 7 adversary proceeding that was brought by NFHLP 8 and to which this issue should be adjudicated. 9 Without taking the exact provisions of those 10 agreements is not an appropriate way to decide 11 that issue. And Mr. Thomas really has not 12 addressed the contractual provisions. 13 surmises that we only stand in the shoes of 14 Adelphia, which is plainly wrong based upon the 15 documents. 16 Additionally, the NFHLP plan in 17 Article 7 provides for a disputed claims fund 18 and right now, the banks believe we're entitled 19 to that right unless there's a consensual 20 resolution allowing the contingent credit or we 21 litigate the issues appropriately in the NFHLP 22 proceeding. Thank you. 23 THE COURT: Thank you. 24 Mr. Schlant? 25 MR. SCHLANT: Thank you,

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

	20
1	Your Honor. Your Honor, on behalf of Fleet, I
2	don't want to go too much over the things that
3	Mr. Brown has already said. I completely agree.
4	THE COURT: Let the record
5	reflect that I do have a present recollection of
6	our previous hearing in which the in which
7	everyone seemed to agree that there's no dispute
8	that the Fleet claims that Fleet never, in
9	connection with the Sabres, ever did business
10	with Adelphia, as I recall. And the Fleet loans
11	were to the previous owners, to the Knoxes, and
12	that those loans were simply assumed by the
13	Rigas or by the Sabres when they were
14	acquired by Regas entities, and all Fleet ever
15	did was receive payments in the ordinary course;
16	is that right?
17	MR. SCHLANT: Well, I want
18	to make sure I understand. There were three
19	loans.
20	THE COURT: Yes.
21	MR. SCHLANT: They were
22	originally with the Knox group.
23	THE COURT: Yes.
24	MR. SCHLANT: Two of them
25	were purchased by a Sabres or by an Adelphia

27 1 entity called Sabres, Inc. in the year 2000. 2 One of them, the concession loan --3 THE COURT: Wait a minute. 4 Let's be clear, though. We've lapsed, since the 5 revelations about the Regas -- the alleged Regas 6 improprieties emerged and since the filing of 7 the Chapter 11s regarding various Adelphia 8 entities in the Southern District, we've begun 9 to lapse into a somewhat sloppy practice of 10 recognizing, I guess, that Adelphia has asserted 11 equitable or beneficial claims of ownership of 12 the entities, and the assets of the entities 13 that are debtors here, but you just said that 14 those loans were assumed by Adelphia entities; 15 they weren't. They were assumed --16 MR. SCHLANT: It was an 17 entity called Sabres, Inc. 18 THE COURT: Right. They 19 were assumed by entities that are debtors here 20 which have become the subject of Adelphia 21 claims; is that right? 22 MR. BROWN: Your Honor, in 23 1995, the only --24 THE COURT: Why don't you 25 come up to the podium, so that you can be heard

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

	28
1	to the people on the speaker phone.
2	MR. BROWN: I'll just lay
3	a factual predicate, proffer, if you will, to
4	the Court.
5	THE COURT: Yes.
6	MR. BROWN: Miss Clemens
7	is here and can vouch if I'm right or wrong.
8	In 1995, the what is now known as
9	the HSBC Arena, was constructed with two primary
10	loans. The first was the construction loan for
11	the obvious purposes of bricks and mortar.
12	HSBC, Key Bank and eventually what is Fleet
13	Bank, were the co-lenders in that loan. They
14	had an initial principal balance of thirty-five
15	million dollars. And that, among other monies,
16	public and private, constructed the HSBC Arena.
17	That loan was secured by essentially a first
18	mortgage lien on all of the assets, with some
19	limited exceptions.
20	The second loan
21	THE COURT: Give me one
22	moment. Off the record, please.
23	(Discussion off the record.)
24	THE COURT: On the record.
25	In 1995, Crossroads Arena, LLC

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

Fleet and others, secured by a first lien on concession -- concession lease and some concession assets and the revenues of the concessions, a conditional guarantee by Niagara Frontier Hockey Limited Partnership in connection with a promise not to relocate, and that guarantee was up to twelve million something. And there was a takeout agreement by SportService. And then there was a line of credit of Fleet up to twelve million dollars.

MR. BROWN: In 1995, you had the construction loan and you had the concession loan. They were the two new deals. The concession loan essentially put the kitchen equipment in the stands in for SportService to prepare and sell food in the arena.

There always was existing to the team a line of credit, and that was a line of credit to NFHLP that in 1995, then Marine Midland Bank -- now HSBC -- was the lender; Fleet eventually acquired that loan from HSBC within a couple of years of that, and in the 1996/1997 period or approximately.

Then we roll forward to March, 2000.

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

	31
1	THE COURT: Yes.
2	MR. BROWN: In March,
3	2000, the construction loan, which was again
4	HSBC, Fleet and Key, was assigned to and
5	purchased by Sabres, Inc., a wholly-owned
6	indirect subsidiary of Adelphia Communications
7	Corporation.
8	THE COURT: All right.
9	Not one of the debtors here?
10	MR. BROWN: No, Your
11	Honor, but CALLC remained the obligor, which is
12	one of your debtors here.
13	THE COURT: Okay.
14	MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, in
15	the prior pleadings throughout, they have always
16	been referred to as ACC Sabres, and Sabres Inc.
17	are the same entity. In the pleadings that we
18	had to avoid confusion, they were always
19	referred to as ACC Sabres, but they and Sabres,
20	Inc., are the same group.
21	THE COURT: Okay.
22	MR. BROWN: Also in March,
23	2000, the revolver loan to the team, the NFHLP,
24	was assigned to Sabres, Inc.
25	THE COURT: Okay.

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

	32
1	MR. BROWN: There was
2	three in March, 2000, there was an agreement for
3	the assignment of the concession loan to Sabres,
4	Inc., but it was not consummated because a
5	condition could not be met, and that condition,
6	as I recall it, was the consent of SportService,
7	who was a guarantor on the loan to the
8	assignment.
9	So that brings us to April, 2003
10	before Your Honor. CALLC, a debtor in this
11	court, is still an obligor on the construction
12	loan. Its obligee is now Sabres, Inc.
13	THE COURT: All right.
14	MR. BROWN: And to effect
15	the sale of the arena and the sale of the team,
16	Sabres, Inc. in the guise of Adelphia, had to
17	consent because otherwise, those assets could
18	not have been transferred free and clear of
19	liens to Mr. Golisano.
20	THE COURT: All right. So
21	Fleet did deal with an Adelphia entity?
22	MR. SCHLANT: In the manner
23	that was described.
24	THE COURT: Yes. As
25	the the Adelphia entity was an obligee?

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

	33
1	MR. BROWN: But it I
2	don't want to speak for Fleet. HSBC, its only
3	dealing with an Adelphia entity was in March,
4	2000 in a sale of the bundle of Ioan rights.
5	Sabres, Inc. bought a loan
6	THE COURT: Yes.
7	MR. BROWN: that had
8	been made to the Knox brothers.
9	THE COURT: All right.
10	Thank you.
11	MR. SCHLANT: And I believe
12	as to those two loans, that's the same with
13	respect to Fleet, they just sold those loans.
14	THE COURT: All right.
15	MR. SCHLANT: Fleet did have
16	a separate relationship, which we described in
17	our papers with Adelphia, that had nothing to do
18	with the Sabres.
19	THE COURT: Right.
20	MR. SCHLANT: The concession
21	loan, as it came forward, came into this case as
22	an obligation of Buffalo Sabres Concession owed
23	to Fleet.
24	THE COURT: Correct.
25	MR. SCHLANT: Fleet had

quarantees and security interests supporting 1 2 that Loan. 3 THE COURT: Correct. 4 MR. SCHLANT: And as 5 Mr. Brown described before, there was a 6 determination made at a certain point that was 7 passed by all parties as to what it would take 8 to satisfy that loan in full. And with court 9 approval and the consent of parties, including 10 Adelphia, that happened in April of 2003. 11 at that point, Fleet released its security 12 interests and guarantees, and accepted the 13 payment that was made at that time on the 14 stipulated amount as the correct amount to pay 15 that loan in full, 16 THE COURT: All right. 17 MR. SCHLANT: And now, three 18 months later, Adelphia having been silent about 19 this before the Court in April of 2003, 20 commences litigation that's entirely 21 inconsistent with the satisfaction of those 22 loans at that time for those numbers. 23 THE COURT: You're certain 24 that there are -- that there is a cause of 25 action in the complaint that makes it clear that

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

1 part of what Adelphia is seeking from Fleet 2 related specifically to the concession loan? 3 MR. SCHLANT: I'm relying on 4 Fleet's main attorneys for that understanding, 5 Levin, Lubarsky & Feigenbaum. They're a New 6 York City law firm that was retained with 7 respect to the adversary proceeding commenced by 8 Adelphia. THE COURT: 9 I recall from 10 earlier submissions, a representation by one or 11 more people that the complaint is hundreds of 12 pages long. 13 MR. SCHLANT: Yes. And 14 somewhat vague, but I believe it's their 15 understanding from an analysis of it, and I 16 could have them confirm that if the Court wants 17 that separately confirmed, that the concession 18. loan is part of that. 19 THE COURT: I don't, at 20 this point, need it separately confirmed. 21 MR. SCHLANT: Where this 22 leaves Fleet unique in this case is with claims 23 that were before this Court as claims against 24 these debtors, released based upon agreements 25 made and stipulations made by Adelphia at a time

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

when, presumably, it knew it or its creditors' committee knew this adversary proceeding was about to happen, not saying a word about it;

Fleet relying on stated facts that would suggest completely otherwise, that once it accepts this payment, it is completely finished with these loans and releasing its collateral and guarantees at that time when it could simply have refused if it knew that this was not going to be payment in full on these loans.

Fleet, therefore, is taking the

Fleet, therefore, is taking the same position that HSBC and Key have taken.

Fleet is satisfied to see the million seven paid to the vendors and the smaller creditors, provided that it receives a conditional credit against the possibility of any liability in the Adelphia adversary proceeding, and now to the Sabres responses to that.

The Sabres assert that any claims that Fleet would have in this regard arise sort of derivatively of Adelphia's claims, we sort of become part of the body of Adelphia claims, and I oppose that and we've asserted in our papers for three reasons that that is not the case.

One is we've cited case law to the

Court that demonstrates that when they avoided payment on a loan to a separate debtor is returned to a third party, that the separate debtor's obligation is reinstated. That's a direct claim, it doesn't depend on Adelphia having claim on the direct claim that arises in favor of the creditor that has to return the payment.

Second, HSBC and Fleet has

language in its documents that in the event of

avoidance, the original obligation is considered

unpaid to the extent of that avoidance.

Third, we don't believe Adelphia can raid Fleet's claims in this case. This would not be a knowing waiver, an intentional waiver of a known right. Adelphia, in April of 2003, is before this Court leaving the right of Fleet to assert. When Adelphia later sues it, which Fleet does not know is going to happen, and if Fleet has to return money based on that lawsuit, that Fleet is going to be held to a waiver because Adelphia is, in April of 2003, waiving it for them the right to make those claims back against the debtor. It can't be a valid waiver because it's not a known right,

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

Fleet has no right to expect that to happen and therefore, it can't be an intentional waiver.

So for all those reasons, we believe that Fleet has direct claims against these debtors -- if it has to return money to the Adelphia creditors' committee in the Adelphia adversary proceeding, and therefore, in this proceeding, Fleet has direct claims against the debtors that should be taken into account at this time, and Fleet has offered to take that into account with the form of credit that we've been discussing.

THE COURT: And who will be addressing the Key Bank?

MR. SALOMON: Your Honor, Chester Salomon for Key Bank. I'll be brief. Aside from our papers and our joinders in the papers of HSBC and Fleet and the arguments of HSBC and Fleet counsel this morning, we really don't have anything to add except this. That our client, at no time, knew of the possibility

of litigation being brought against it by Adelphia or the creditors' committee in early

2003. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Other argument from --

MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, just very briefly. I believe the Court fully understands the issues and has spent the time to read the papers. But just in response, very briefly, to the arguments made by Fleet. Certainly not our position that any of the banks waive our rights.

Adelphia signed a subordination agreement and the result of that subordination agreement adheres to the benefit of the banks in the Adelphia AP and in the Sabres AP, and therefore the banks will get full and adequate relief in regard to that. We're not suggesting the banks waive their rights; we're saying that if, in fact, as a result of the actions that the Adelphia debtors took in this proceeding, there's a million six that could have otherwise been available to the banks, the Court, at a subsequent date, can resolve that issue.

Secondly, with regard to the issue of direct claims in both HSBC's papers as well as Fleet's papers, irrespective of whatever the rights may be of a party who is sued for a

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

fraudulent conveyance in the Sabres AP to recover rights back and to have a claim within that, that is totally unrelated to their rights to assert such claims against the debtors in this proceeding.

This Ioan is sold in 1999.

Whether it's a fraudulent conveyance or not, I have no opinion, I have no way of knowing, no knowledge. If it's, in fact determined, after adjudication, to be a fraudulent conveyance, I'm comfortable that whatever results accrue from the execution of the stipulation and order in this case can be adjudicated at that point as a settlement.

Finally, with regards to the debtor we have a limited purpose here and suggest the Court is left with three alternatives. The first, which I don't think anyone here favors, is to hold the three point six million dollars in place until all these matters --

THE COURT:

MR. THOMAS:

One point six.

One point six,

excuse me, Your Honor, one point six million

dollars until all these matters are resolved.

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

Secondly, the Court can take the middle position, which is that it can allow the distribution to go forward, reserve all of the rights for all of the parties for another day, and the third position is to adopt the position of the banks and either adjudicate this today or, in the alternative, since there are various matters that are being adjourned and will be resolved shortly, would be to put the banks and the Adelphia debtors on an agreed-upon briefing schedule and allow the issue of whether they're entitled to a setoff today as opposed to at the time of the adjudication of the cases to be decided, but not to allow that issue to hold up the distribution of the funds at this time.

THE COURT:

All right.

MR. THOMAS:

Thank you,

Your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT:

Does

Adelphia's representative wish to be heard?

MR. ZINMAN:

Yes. This is

Dan Zinman from Kasowitz, Benson, Torres &

Friedman. Just a few points. I believe it was

HSBC's counsel, I have a few comments to --

responses to his comments.

1

2

4 5

6

7

8

9

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

First, we object to the

characterization of the so-called joint orders regarding jurisdiction, as we will not have dueling bankruptcy cases. The orders speak for themselves. We don't believe that they are necessarily as broad, should be read as broadly as HSBC. Clearly, we can argue about that at the appropriate time.

Also, any allegation that we don't care what Your Honor did earlier or presumably what we did in conjunction so ordered by Your Honor, or rather Adelphia, not the creditors' committee, but the Adelphia debtors, obviously that's not true. Again, in HSBC's desire to arque its case, it seems to be making this into something about an insulting action, and all they're doing is mischaracterizing what is, in essence, a simple jurisdictional dispute between their desire to have issues heard in your court and our desire to have the first issues heard in the first filed action in the Southern District of New York. And again, we can reserve all our rights to dispute all these issues in the appropriate matter at the appropriate time.

THE COURT:

Thank you.

Mr. Netzer, did you have anything to add? 1 No, I'll let 2 MR. NETZER: the creditors' committee remarks stand. 3 THE COURT: All right. 4 All right. One question in my mind, in 5 connection with the argument that the procedure 6 being utilized by the debtors here in this court 7 fail -- would fail, I quess, is the answer, of 8 due process, if this Court were not to grant the 9 10 credit that the banks seek, raises a question in my mind about due process to Adelphia if I were 11 to -- shall I say the -- whether any order that 12 adjudicated in favor of the bank's credit would 13 14 similarly be argued by Adelphia for one of 15 jurisdiction. MR. BROWN: Your Honor, 16 this is Bill Brown, for those on the phone. 17 18 Your Honor, we, HSBC, consents to you and Judge 19 Gerber, if you so choose, speaking about the appropriate jurisdiction of allocations here to 20 21 the extent that you believe it. With regard to 22 your question, however, Adelphia appeared in 23 this Court on the sale, on the plan issues, and 24 these are germane to those.

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

So if I

THE COURT:

25

1

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

2021

22

23

2425

understand, then, this portion of the argument, the argument is that it would violate due process for the Court to approve the debtor's proposal unless the Court were to grant the credit, but that it would not violate due process for the Court to approve it on the condition that the credit is granted?

MR. BROWN: The latter point is really for the purposes of a hoped-for consensual resolution. Speaking for HSBC, we want to make it clear that HSBC is willing to have the money released, and therefore the small vendors paid, as long as to some small amount, the fact that it has a claim is recognized here and allowed for on a contingent basis, and therefore, we would avoid, at this point, a lengthy adjudication about -- or more lengthy, at least, about whether the subordination is apropos, or whether the distribution has to wait until a later date because, for example, Your Honor, in this four hundred, four hundred and fifty-defendant complaint, HSBC has no other involvement to all of the allegations in that complaint. They all relate to lenders who lent money to Adelphia. And we're not similarly

situated with those people.

fashion in January, 2003 and said, hey, we've got a problem with the installment payments that CALLC made to you going back to 1995, or the fact that you sold the loan to Sabres Inc. in 2000, then HSBC and its fellow construction lenders would have been in a position, in the spring of 19 -- of 2003 to be the counter parties with Mr. Golisano before those liens were released.

THE COURT: Okay. But
those are good arguments for why you should
maybe, eventually, be able to reach a consensual
resolution of the Southern District Bankruptcy
Court litigation as to HSBC, in any event.

My immediate concern is how to get this done in a way that is respectful of the fact that it might -- if push were to come to shove over the issue of jurisdiction to grant a credit, it could require an evidentiary hearing; it could require -- because it may involve issues of judicial estoppel, and issues of judicial estoppel sometimes involve evidentiary hearings, and I would want to be respectful in

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

what I do of the fact that while I'm certain that Judge Gerber and I would be able to agree on how to proceed on those issues, I do not want to -- I don't want to bat heads with him. Go ahead.

MR. BROWN:

Well, Your

Honor has done that successfully before, and Laidlaw is a prime example. And there are other cases, and we're perfectly willing to allow Your Honor to engage in that consideration. But on that very subject, I thought that's what NFHLP's adversary proceeding was for. Adelphia and its creditors' committee are parties to that adversary proceeding in this court; they have not answered. Now they seek to be dismissed. We have cross-claimed against them and so has Fleet.

MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, in response to the narrow question of due process, it would be the debtor's position, we made an effort to draft the order accordingly, that if the distribution is approved, it's without prejudice of any and all rights, remedies, claims including the right to argue that the Court lacks jurisdiction in regard to other

matters.

I would also be happy to put in the order, if it makes the Court more comfortable, and other parties more comfortable, that this is without prejudice to the bank seeking the same relief requested here; that the relief they have requested is not being denied with prejudice in any way.

We're simply distributing the money which I understand the banks at the end of the day don't dispute, and therefore the issue of whether the credit should be issued immediately or shortly hereafter, can be resolved and if it does take some sort of evidentiary hearing, it will not hold up the distribution.

So my view is that if the Court were to grant this order, it is not necessarily deciding -- it is not denying with prejudice the bank's arguments or claims today; it's simply deferring those to be asserted -- and they need not be asserted at the time of the AP; it can be asserted within two or three weeks if they wish to bring an appropriate motion.

THE COURT:

So your

argument would be, then, if we forget the -- if we ignore the fact that we have this stipulation of dismissal pending and the debtor's motion in that regard, and if we ignore the fact that that's opposed by the banks and set that aside, and look at this narrowly as if the only matter before the Court were the matter of the distribution of the funds with regard to which the banks want a credit, that I can grant the distribution of funds without a resolution of the matter of the credit today?

MR. THOMAS: By reserving everyone's rights and remedies and making it clear that that, in no way, a decision in that regard is a decision that could be in any way have collateral estoppel or some sort of effect that the rights that the banks have sought today were in some way denied or adjudicated; simply that those can be brought back, even as part of the pretrial people can set dates for those to come back and be heard.

In addition, as a practical matter, as a representative of the debtors as well as the creditors' committees, at that point in time, we do not have to be active in that, we

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

do not have to charge the estate for any 1 activities in that regard. That really moves it 2 to the plane of a dispute between the Adelphia 3 debtors and the banks, and our hope is to get 4 this money out, in part, I must confess, because 5 people call me every day, since --6 THE COURT: Yes. 7 MR. THOMAS: Thank you, 8 9 Your Honor.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right.

Does anyone else wish to make any further comment? All right. I'm going to take five minutes to formulate the language of a ruling. I'll leave the people on the phone. We'll go off the record. The speakers will be off in chambers so that you can feel free to socialize or whatever for five minutes.

(A recess was then taken.)

THE COURT: Please be seated. Let's essentially call the roll and make sure we didn't lose anyone along the way. I see that we have Mr. Thomas and we have Ms. Hill and Ms. Clemens, we have Mr. Brown, Mr. Schlant, Miss Storie.

How about on the phone, do we have

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

50 1 Mr. Netzer? Yes, Your 2 MR. NETZER: Honor. 3 Mr. Zinman? THE COURT: 4 5 MR. ZINMAN: Yes, I'm here, Your Honor. 6 Ms. Keynes and 7 THE COURT: 8 Mr. Salomon? Yes, Your 9 MR. SALOMON: 10 Honor. THE COURT: Okay. This is 11 12 my ruling. I find that the only issue 13 appropriate for resolution today is the narrow question of whether the distribution that was at 14 15 the heart of the plan and that was a highly 16 material element of this Court's approval of the 17 asset purchase, whether that distribution may be 18 ordered by this Court without any adjudication 19 of any other issue raised by any other party. 20 On that narrow issue, I rule that 21 there is no violation of due process and that 22 the distribution will go forward. All other 23 issues raised by any other party will be 24 addressed hereafter in accordance with due 25 process and with statutes applicable and the

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

We were hoping

MR. THOMAS:

25

	52
1	Your Honor could pick a day that would be
2	that these issues could be addressed other than
3	on the regular calendar, and unless there were
4	conflicts, we would accommodate whatever days
5	the Court has available in approximately
6	twenty-five to thirty days from now.
7	THE COURT: Now, you're
8	referring to the other issues, the motion to
9	approve the stipulation and the motion and
10	the opposition thereto. I granted the Fleet
11	Bank motion to intervene today, and so then we
12	had the cross motion, is it?
13	MR. BROWN: We have a
14	motion by HSBC in the adversary proceeding to
15	enforce the plan.
16	THE COURT: Right. Yes.
17	The Adelphia waiver provision in the plan, is
18	that right?
19	MR. BROWN: The avoidance
20	action waiver.
21	THE COURT: Paragraph 7
22	dot 06?
23	MR. BROWN: Yes, Your
24	Honor.
25	MR. ZINMAN: Your Honor, if

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

1 I may. It's Dan Zinman from Kasowitz again. 2 think one issue, procedural issue that needs to 3 be resolved is exactly how we're going to go 4 forward. I don't know that it's the best idea 5 to argue everything at once. I think, from my 6 point of view, I'd rather argue the juris-7 dictional question first; if Your Honor doesn't 8 have jurisdiction, then a lot of the other 9 issues, vis-a-vis HSBC's motion for a permanent 10 injunction, would be kind of moot at that point. 11 THE COURT: Okay. I see 12 what you're saying. Now, you're signatory to 13 the stip that would dismiss Adelphia out. 14 MR. ZINMAN: No, I am not. 15 The creditor's committee I don't believe is 16 actually a signatory to that, although we are a 17 beneficiary to that. 18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, we 20 have no objection that if the Court were to set 21 a date that parties, that other parties can 22 bring within the rules of this court for timing 23 whatever motions they feel are appropriate at 24 that time as well. 25 THE COURT: That's a good

Let's get everything out on the table. will continue my earlier pretrial order, which tolled the running of all limitations, periods and so forth, pending another date that we should fix now for any other -- for the purpose of submissions of anything else that people feel needs to be on the table. And I'm not here referring to briefs, because I don't think we should be -- we will be briefing the whole universe of issues here if we don't first decide what is appropriate to take up here, and in what sequence, so I'm not looking for briefs. I just want to see if we need any more moving papers. MR. ZINMAN: Your Honor, I assume that would not include our motion to dismiss --THE COURT: You're assuming that it would not include it? MR. ZINMAN: Yeah. If Your Honor did want to brief that --THE COURT: Well, our

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

local rules don't require, perhaps unlike many

require a brief in connection with such motions.

of the local rules that you're used to, don't

Here regularly, the motion to dismiss, or the

motion for summary judgment is made and we don't get the briefing until after we've had an initial return date on the motion, if it's not decided what needs to be briefed.

So no, I specifically would like a motion, if that's your intention, I'd like a motion to dismiss. I want the moving papers on the table, I just don't want -- I don't want anyone to brief these issues until we see and have on the table all of the conflicting theories, okay.

So the question that I have is, how long will it take -- what date would be comfortable for everyone to have figured out what motions they need to make and so forth, recognizing that the opportunity to brief will come later when I decide what needs to be briefed and in what sequence. Do you think thirty days or sixty days? I don't know, what do you think?

MR. THOMAS: The week of May 3rd would be adequate for me; that's thirty days out, roughly.

MR. BROWN: That's absolutely fine, Your Honor. I'd like to join

family would be certainly grateful.

THE COURT:

MR. ZINMAN:

the issue.

THE COURT: That's no problem at all. Why don't we, then, fix -- why don't we say, then, that the deadline -- I want to be careful that I don't accidentally create problems if someone comes up with something

later.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

25

Let me ask that all the issues that people believe are appropriate to have on the table at the earlier stages, at the earliest stages, should be filed and served no later than noon on Thursday, May the 13th, and then we will fix Thursday, May the 27th --

21 MR. ZINMAN:

I'm sorry,

what time on the 20th?

THE COURT:

I didn't say

24 the 20th.

MR. THOMAS:

27th. Two

57 1 seven. 2 MR. ZINMAN: I'm sorry. 3 THE COURT: The 27th. So 4 I'd like to change that to Tuesday, May the 5 25th, Tuesday, May the 25th at ten A.M. would be 6 the return date and time here, in court, return 7 date and time to which I'm adjourning everything 8 that's pending and which you may use as the 9 return date for these other things. But do get 10 them filed and served by noon on the, what did I 11 say, the 13th? So that you have ample 12 opportunity to have some back and forth about 13 what you see as people file these things. 14 MR. THOMAS: Your Honor, 15 consistent with our earlier statement, I believe 16 that there would be no appearance by telephone 17 at that time? 18 THE COURT: On the 13th? 19 MR. THOMAS: On the 25th. 20 THE COURT: Oh, on the 21 25th. l would prefer not. I think it's --22 MR. BROWN: I agree. 23 THE COURT: The reason 24 that I shifted it from the 27th to the 25th is

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

so that I can block out the whole day, and I

25

	58
1	would hope that if need be, people could caucus
2	right here on the premises of the court and I'm
3	going to give you the whole day in hopes that we
4	can have a resolution of as much as is possible
5	on that day. Mr. Brown?
6	MR. BROWN: I'm fully in
7	favor of that, Your Honor. I think it's a
8	terrific idea.
9	THE COURT: Okay. So
10	you'll have my whole day on the 25th of May,
11	beginning at ten o'clock.
12	CHRISTINE KLIMKO: Can I just
13	clarify?
14	THE COURT: Yes. Go
15	ahead.
16	CHRISTINE KLIMKO: This is going
17	to be the HSBC motion on the 7 point 06?
18	THE COURT: All the
19	pending motions, yes.
20	CHRISTINE KLIMKO: And the
21	approval of the stip.
22	THE COURT: That's right.
23	Those are all going to the 25th at ten.
24	MR. THOMAS: We ask that
25	the pretrial be adjourned to the same date.

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

I'm not sure

MR. ZINMAN:

25

That's

what would happen.

1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2 THE COURT: There would be argument on the 25th. At least scheduling. 3 lf 4 you think -- the practice in our court, 5 typically, is for parties to return -- to come 6 back on an initial return date, let me know 7 what's really at issue. I've read the papers at 8 that point, I can ask questions, I can seek 9 clarification, we can agree on the way to 10 proceed on the issues and then I can order

briefing on what makes the most sense.

the way we usually proceed.

MR. ZINMAN: I understand now. Thank you.

THE COURT: You're
welcome. Now, sometimes with representation of
this high quality, sometimes counsel -- I'm not
prohibiting briefs, but if you think that it's
very -- that it would be useful to you to have
other people see the strength of your argument,
fine, but I don't expect anyone to file
responsive briefs. And I do not want people
feeling, if someone were to submit a brief

because they think it would be useful to see the

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

strength of the legal argument, I don't want

61
someone saying, oh, gee whiz, they briefed that
question, so now I'm going to have to brief it.
No, that is not the case.
MR. ZINMAN: I understand.
THE COURT: Okay? Great.
Yes, Mr. Schlant?
MR. SCHLANT: I'm sorry, I
know everybody was about to go. We had one
thing that was adjourned to today from
previously.
THE COURT: What was that?
MR. SCHLANT: It was the
motion of Fleet to enlarge the time to file its
proofs of claim.
THE COURT: Oh, that's
right. That's extended to the same date and
time.
MR. SCHLANT: Okay.
THE COURT: Is that right?
MR. SCHLANT: Well, what we
had discussed the last time was there was no
opposition below the level of there was no
opposition by anyone that would not participate
in the segregated account if it were allowed to
be disbursed, and that if we reached a

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

resolution on allowing that to be disbursed, then it would lead to a different way of looking at the Fleet motion, and my understanding was at this point, since the segregated account is going to be paid out, there's really no opposition to it.

avoid that question. I think that probably I have overruled on the objection because the limited objections to disbursement said there would be no objection if we got the credit. I'm saying that's not appropriately before me today and that I can go ahead and order the disbursement without granting that, so I don't know how you want to characterize it. It's fine with me to characterize it as approving disbursement over the objection of the banks. You can decide whether that's what you want to --

MR. THOMAS: Mr. Schlant and I will discuss it. He's raising a slightly different point, Your Honor. His suggestion is that having had the Court decide to make the distribution free and clear of claims --

THE COURT: Then there was

	63
1	no opposition.
2	MR. THOMAS: then in
3	effect it's kind of moot, if it's important for
4	other reasons that Fleet have filed proofs of
5	claim, albeit late, as long as from the debtor's
6	point of view they don't interfere with the
7	distribution, then
8	THE COURT: You're right.
9	MR. THOMAS: That's what I
10	believe the Court
11	THE COURT: You're right.
12	I remember being briefly surprised that there
13	was no objection, but then I remembered that
14	what's going on up here is, vis-a-vis the one
15	point six million was very small potatoes in
16	comparison to the regards in which the banks are
17	similarly situated elsewhere.
18	MR. THOMAS: Mr. Schlant
19	and I will prepare an order and circulate it.
20	If none of the parties in interest have an
21	objection
22	THE COURT: Then it's
23	granted.
24	MR. THOMAS: If they have a
25	claim, as long as it comes after the order

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223

BUYERS & KACZOR REPORTING SERVICES, INC. (716) 852-2223